1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA JOHN GILBERT, Plaintiff, VS. APC NATCHIQ, INC., Defendant. Case No. 3:03-CV-00174-RRB DEPOSITION OF MARK C. NELSON

## June 15, 2006

#### **APPEARANCES:**

## METRO COURT REPORTING

1	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	MR. KENNETH L. COVELL
2		Attorney at Law Law Offices of Kenneth L. Covell
3		712 West 8th Avenue Fairbanks, Alaska 99701
4		(907) 452-4377
5	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	MS. PATRICIA ZOBEL
6		DeLisio Moran Geraghty & Zobel, P.C.
7		Attorneys at Law 943 West 6th Avenue
8		Anchorage, Alaska 99501 (907) 279-9574
9		(111)
10	ALSO PRESENT:	MR. DOUGLAS SMITH
11		
12	*	* * *
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PURSUANT TO NOTICE, the Deposition of MARK C. NELSON was taken on behalf of the Plaintiff before Cheri Tabor, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for Metro Court Reporting at the law offices of DeLisio Moran Geraghty & Zobel, P.C., 943 West 6th Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska 99501, on the 15th day of June 2006, commencing at the hour of 10:30 a.m.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Direct Examination by Mr. Covell ......4

## METRO COURT REPORTING

1	<u>EXHIBITS</u>
2	N-1 - Memo from Mark Nelson
3	N-3 - Safety Supervisor Job Announcement32 N-4 - Supplemental Disclosure from Patricia
4	Zobel32
5	N-5 - Safety Department Organizational Chart33 N-6 - New job announcements and description43
6	description43
7	* * *
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

### METRO COURT REPORTING

## METRO COURT REPORTING

Carr to you?

<u>A</u>	Is that the yes.
Q	Okay. Since 2003, I guess what I'm trying to get at is
3	briefly where you are in the organization since last we
4	spoke. What I understood when we last spoke was you
5	were president of APC Natchiq, is that right or wrong
6	or close?
<b>7</b>	Correct.
Q	All right. And that was 26 of August 2003, does that
9	sound about right?
<b></b> O	It's right. Correct.
<b>Q</b> 1	Right around August 26th? Okay. So, since then where
12	have you been job wise or organizationally with APC?
13	And I understand that there's AES Energy Services and
14	that's all somewhat unclear to me, but if you could try
15	to briefly run us through your position, let's say
16	relative to your old position organizationally?
<b>全</b> 7	2004, I moved to from the presidency of APC to
18	the company name was changed to ASRC Energy Services
19	Operations and Maintenance. Sometime in the period
20	after that deposition, until the time I left, we
21	changed the company name. I moved to the parent
22	company, ASRC Energy.
<b>2</b> 3	Okay.
<b>⊉</b> 4	Headed up the business development group for the parent
25	company for about a year. And in the December of
	this year, moved over at a different job offer.

745 West Fourth Avenue, Suite 425 Anchorage, Alaska 99501 (907) 276-3876

METRO COURT REPORTING

- 1 Moved over as a COO of a construction holding company.
- Q Which....
- A I'm no longer employed by ASRC Energy Services.
- Q Okay. So you went to this construction holding
- 5 company, sometime in the last year or so, I think.
- In the last six months.
- Q Okay. And so you're out of ASRC entirely, at that
- g point?
- A Right. I'm out of ASRC Energy Services.
- $Q_0$  Is the company you're with now, an ASRC company?
- A<sub>1</sub> Yes.
- Q2 And what's the name of that?
- ASRC Construction Holding Company.
- Q4 Okay. So you were in the presidency through '04, and
- then you went into marketing and development, is that
- 16 right?
- A7 Correct.
- Qg And what did you market and develop, just briefly?
- A9 Business of ASRC Energy Services.
- Qo Okay. So you still would have been president in April
- '03 when the positions of safety specialist and safety
- supervisor were reclassified from exempt to non- -- no,
- from non-exempt to exempt?
- A4 Correct.
- Q5 All right. And assuming Mr. Gilbert ended his

employment about April '03, he would have been one of  $METRO\ COURT\ REPORTING$ 

- the employees under your direct command?
- At that time I was president, if he was an employee of
- 3 APC, he would have been in a -- in the direct line
- 4 of --
- Q Okay. And why don't we cover this question right now:
- Do you know Mr. Gilbert vaguely or not at all?
- A Only by name.
- Q Okay. And is that because of the lawsuit or is that
- g because at the time he was there, you had some exposure
- 10 to him?
- A<sub>1</sub> Probably a combination of both.
- Q2 Okay. But basically it's.....
- A3 If he walked in here right now, I wouldn't know the
- 14 guy.
- Q5 All right. Basically, the familiarity is if you saw
- his name on a roster, you'd go, that's one of my guys
- or I think that's one of my guys?
- $A_8$  In the context of APC, sure.
- Qo In <u>Zuber</u> we discussed you examining the position of
- safety specialist and making a determination whether or
- 21 not that position ought to be eligible for overtime or
- not eligible for overtime, right?
- Ag Can you rep- --
- Q4 Sure.
- In this previous deposition?
- Q In the previous case, in <u>Zuber</u> -- correct me if I METRO COURT REPORTING

- interchange the names here. In the <u>Zuber</u> case, we
- g spent a lot of time talking with you about whether or
- not the safety specialist job was exempt or non-exempt.
- A I don't -- I don't recall. The case -- we spent time
- around another position, a warehouseman, may -- we may
- have. I'd have to look back to the deposition. I
- 7 don't know how much detail in the deposition we talked
- 8 about safety specialist.
- Q Okay. Well.....
- $A_0$  Well maybe we did, yes.
- Q1 Okay. Let me represent to you that's reflected in your
- 12 deposition.
- A3 Okay.
- Q4 That you spent a fair amount of time discussing
- conversations with Randy Carr, using some worksheets
- concerning questions of whether or not somebody ought
- to be exempt under the administrative professional or
- other exemptions. Is this refreshing your recollection
- 19 at all?
- Ao Yes, okay. Safety special.....
- $Q_1$  Right.
- Not a supervisor.
- Q3 Right.
- A4 Okay, yes.
- Q<sub>5</sub> Did you do any examination of the position of safety

supervisor to determine whether or not it ought to be

### METRO COURT REPORTING

- 1 exempt for overtime or not?
- MS. ZOBEL: You're speaking of 1998 or at any time?
- MR. COVELL: Let's say ever, for the time being and then we can break it down by time.
- At the time, and I don't -- which year this was -- '97,
- 7 '90- -- the same timeframe I spoke with the State
- g representative which was Carr, Randy Carr.
- Q Right.
- An I -- I went through all position on the North Slope.
- Q1 Okay. And so if Mr. Carr's letter is June 26, '97, it
- would be in that timeframe?
- A3 Right.
- Q4 Okay. And you've got a copy of that there with you,
- 15 right?
- A6 Right.
- Q7 Okay. And that's alternatively referred to on the face
- of it, in the right-hand corner as WHOL-122, right?
- Ag Correct.
- MR. COVELL: Why don't we get this marked pumber one, here please, madam clerk.
- 22 COURT REPORTER: Exhibit N-1 marked.
- (Deposition Exhibit N-1 marked)
- MR. COVELL: And then just for the record we should probably make these Z's in front of the APC's, would you agree with that?

- MS. ZOBEL: G. Why would you do Z? 1 MR. COVELL: Why don't we go off record for 2. just a second. (Off record) (On record) 5 MR. COVELL: And for purposes of clarity here, we've agreed that the N-1 will place a Z on each page in front of the APC numbers, because it's our belief that they came from the Zuber case originally, in order to avoid confusion with similarly numbered pages disclosed in Gilbert. All right. can get back on my train of thought here. (By Mr. Covell) And in looking at the last two pages Q2 then of N-1, that's that Randy Carr letter of June 26, 13 '97 to yourself, and it's alternatively designated near 14 the upper right-hand corner as WHOL-122, is that right? 15 Correct. **₽**6 MS. ZOBEL: Could I ask what the WHOL is? 17
- MR. COVELL: It's wage and hour opinion letter.
- 19 MS. ZOBEL: Of course, it is. All right. I

was thinking you had put it on there.....

- MR. COVELL: No.
- MS. ZOBEL: .....in the prior deposition.
- MR. COVELL: Okay.
- MS. ZOBEL: Too many numbers in this thing.
- MR. COVELL: And acronyms, too.

MS. ZOBEL: Yes.

## METRO COURT REPORTING

- Q (By Mr. Covell) So, you said, going back -- testing my
- memory here, you said at the time contemporaneous to
- that, you did a review of all positions in APC?
- A Correct.
- Q Okay. And one of those --
- It's one of the positions.
- sound stupid, but for clarity of the record we have to
- g ask the redundant questions.
- MS. ZOBEL: And I think I need to clarify the record here with the regard to the safety supervisor position, because I think that they were different at the time that Mark was doing this in '97 and '98 and I think that comes from the testimony of Doug Smith, because when he came in it was a different -- he created that position. It was different from what had been held by Mr. Cannon or Gary Buchanan, I think.

  Not Gary Buchanan, but other people who had held that. And you gan query him about that, but that's my understanding and I den't want the record to be messed up because we're talking applies and oranges.
- MR. COVELL: Well that's.....
- MS. ZOBEL: See if that's his understanding.
- MR. COVELL: All right.
- Q4 (By Mr. Covell) So, around that time of Mr. Carr's
- letter, you did a review of the safety supervisor

position to see whether or not he qualified for

## METRO COURT REPORTING

- overtime or not? He said yes to that question.
- 2 Subsequent question now, is tell me what you did in
- that regard? In other words tell me how you conducted
- 4 your review.
- A For a safety supervisor?
- Q Uh-huh.
- A I started with the position -- the employees in the
- position. In the year '96, '97, Bob Cannon was the
- g supervisor, one of the supervisors, and basically
- 10 talked with those employees or that person about the
- position. Although at the time, those positions were
- direct reports of mine, so I also had a pretty good
- background of what they were doing for me as a direct
- 14 report. So the combination of those two things, I
- could draw a conclusion in that if I felt the -- there
- was further research I needed to do, then I would
- 17 further research the position.
- Q8 Okay. And did that come to pass or not?
- Ag Well for....
- Q<sub>0</sub> Did you do further research?
- The safety supervisors were a position that I needed
- further clarification around which was also part of my
- conversation, in general, with the Wage and Hour
- 24 Division.
- Q<sub>5</sub> All right. So, you talked to Mr. Cannon? You had a

conversation with the Wage and Hour Division and we

## METRO COURT REPORTING

- should assume that conversation or conversations was
- with Mr. Carr or not?
- A I know I had at least one conversation with Mr. Carr.
- 4 You're drawing on 10 years ago now.
- g Sure.
- I -- I know I talked with him. I can almost remember
- 7 some of it very vividly -- the details of the
- g conversation with Mr. Cannon, but how many
- g conversations with the State now, I don't recall.
- $Q_0$  Okay. But, it's my recollection, I've looked at your
- deposition more recently.....
- Q3 I think you said you may have talked to Mr. Carr five
- or six times. Something in that nature would be --
- okay. But besides -- was there another actor besides
- 16 Mr. Carr, that you recollect?
- A7 I don't recall.
- Qg Okay. So you talked to Cannon and you talked to Carr
- and then what conclusion, if any, did you reach about
- 20 the exempt or non-exempt status of the safety super- --
- let me pull that question. Did you do anything else in
- considering whether or not the safety supervisor ought
- to be exempt or non-exempt?
- A4 If the file didn't reference a written document, and
- with the safety supervisors, I don't recall doing one.

I don't think there was a -- there's a stand METRO COURT REPORTING

checklist. I -- you've got a copy of it, that we used 1 to do back then, or I had done a number of them at the 2 I don't recall doing one for the safety time. 3 supervisors. 4 Okay. I doubt that I did given my recollection of the ð position at this time. 7 And then you brought up the checklist and whatnot -papers. I'm not aware of any papers that relate to the 9 safety supervisor analysis as opposed to there are some 10 that you mentioned in regard to the safety specialist 11 position. 12 The second tier. Right, that's correct. **A**3 Okay. And so that -- me not having any comports was **Q**4 your recollection of what you did? 15 Uh-huh (affirmative). **₽**6 **Q**7 Okay. All right. What training or experience did you have at that time in human relation? I'm sorry, human 18 resources or employee resources, personnel, whatever 19 you want to call it that would qualify you to make an 20 exempt, non-exempt determination? 21 Well, I was competent to talk with the State, and read **A**2. and understand the regs as best I could interpret. 23 think at the time I asked our Anchorage office for 24 assistance for a second or third opinion and based upon 25 my formal education, I came to some conclusions around

## METRO COURT REPORTING

1	all of the positions on the North Slope whether they
2	were exempt or non-exempt.
9	Let me paraphrase here, just to try to move things
4	along. If I'm suggesting incorrectly, straighten me
5	out, but you read and write English, you've gone to
6	school, you have a degree in accounting, you can
7	analyze things as well as the next person on the street
8	so to speak, or perhaps better because of your training
9	and education of whatever field you're in, and that
10	enables you to make that determination, is that
11	essentially what you're telling me?
<b>⊉</b> 2	Correct.
2₃	Okay. And then my question, at least in part, leans
14	toward saying besides having the abilities that many
15	might, do you have any specialized training, education
16	or experience that would lend you an ability perhaps
17	above somebody else with that and I don't mean to
18	demean accounting, but to call it the generic
19	education, training and experience as opposed to some
20	nature of specialized training, experience or education
21	in the area of human resources? Do you under that as a
22	question?
<b>⊉</b> 3	Is that a question?
24	That was the question.
<b>⊉</b> 5	I'm not sure I know how to answer. Let me
Q	All right. Do you have specialized training and METRO COURT REPORTING

- experience in human resources?
- A Outside of the work place, beyond conference -- I think
- one of them lies with the State or some of those --
- Q Okay. You've been in conference or seminar, but
- 5 generally not?
- Those are specialized trainings around wage and hour,
- they last 3, 4 days -- put on by the State, that type
- g of thing. Beyond that, no.
- Q Okay.
- 10 MR. COVELL: I'd like to take a brief pause
- here madame reporter.

  12 (Off record)
- 13 (Deposition Exhibit N-2 marked)
- (On record)
- MR. COVELL: Mr. Nelson, we marked for you
- Eghibit N-3, is it?
- 17 COURT REPORTER: N-2.
- Q8 (By Mr. Covell) N-2, which is your former deposition
- and I directed your attention to pages 26, line 23
- through page 28, line 20. You've had a chance to read
- that off record?
- A2 (No audible answer)
- Q3 You need to answer audibly.
- A4 Okay. I'm sorry. I didn't understand it was a
- question -- yes.
- Q All right. Thank you. Is what you're saying there in  $METRO\ COURT\ REPORTING$

- that passage about a review of the safety supervisor
- position, the same thing you're telling me today?
- A Yes.
- Q Okay.
- 5 (Off record comments)
- And besides that review then you did at that time of
- 7 the safety supervisor position for eligibility for
- 8 overtime from that time until you left your job as
- 9 president in 2004, were you involved in any other
- 10 reviews of the safety supervisor position for
- eligibility of overtime?
- $\mathbb{A}_2$  No.
- Q3 Okay. Were you aware of any other reviews of the
- safety supervisor position for eligibility of overtime
- as opposed to being involved in? Again, it may sound
- like a stupid question, but just trying to keep it
- 17 clear.
- As Sounds like it. And if I understand it, I -- the
- 19 answer is no.
- Q<sub>0</sub> All right. Thank you.
- You want this exhibit back?
- MR. COVELL: Yes, we'll just stack them up yight here in front is fine.
- Q4 We've already given you number one. Why don't you turn
- your attention to N-1 there. In looking at N-1, the

first document there is December 7, '96 memo from

## METRO COURT REPORTING

- yourself to Anne Hippe. Is this something that either
- sparked, or was it the beginning of your review of the
- yarious positions at APC for overtime?
- Around this time, sure.
- Q Okay. And then following that page is a memo from
- 6 Christopher Boyle to various people talking about, I
- guess, day rate and reviewing positions for exempt,
- 8 non-exempt status, is that right?
- A Correct.
- $Q_0$  And is that something that -- let me represent to you
- in your last deposition even though your name's not on
- here, I don't believe it is, you represented that you
- saw that or would have seen it, does that comport with
- 14 your recollection today?
- A5 Likely.
- Q6 Sure. Okay. You see there where it says, please
- provide me with the requested information by January
- 18 15, 1997?
- Ag Yes.
- Q<sub>0</sub> Okay. And that would be directed towards the exemption
- issue, right?
- A2 Yes.
- Q3 Okay. Did you provide information to Mr. Boyle that
- date or otherwise in regard to the exempt, non-exempt
- 25 status of positions with APC?
- A I don't recall.

- Q Okay. And again, if you did, at least as far as the
- safety supervisor goes, you would expect that there
- 3 would be any writings in that regard?
- A I don't re- -- I don't recall.
- Q Okay. That's fine. To your recollection are there any
- 6 writings -- withdraw that. I think you said you
- 7 reviewed every position at APC for exempt, non-exempt
- g status, is that a fair characterization or unfair?
- A Fair.
- Qo Okay. And approximately how many positions would that
- be? What's the range in numbers there?
- A2 I wasn't reviewing non-exempt positions. I was focused
- on exempt only because as a non-exempt position,
- there's not a liability.
- Q5 Right. Okay.
- For employers, anyway. I looked at the exempt
- positions. We could have had a few dozen exempt
- positions at the time.
- Q9 Okay.
- 1'm guess- -- guesstimating.
- Q1 Okay. And then you reviewed all of those?
- As Some would have been fast -- certainly my own position,
- quickly come to a conclusion around, versus others
- 24 which I would have had triggers that would require
- 25 further investigation.
- Q Right. As to any of those positions do you know if  $METRO\ COURT\ REPORTING$

745 West Fourth Avenue, Suite 425 Anchorage, Alaska 99501

(907) 276-3876

there are any writings concerning the analysis for 1 classification of the positions? 2 I think there were at the time, 10 years ago. Ą Okay. Q I don't know if I addressed that in my earlier Ą deposition. My memory today is far -- is more fuzzy 6 about what I wrote or didn't write 10 years ago. 7 We do know that we have this WHOL-122, right, in regard to --9 Yes. **A**0 Beyond that, and, again, I realize this is **Q**1 redundant, but to be clear for the record, do you know 12 if there are any other writings that would commemorate 13 in any form a review for exemption or non-exemption? 14 And when you say writing, you mean from a determination **A**5 letter like the one you're referencing WHOL or --16 **Q**7 From it being a formal WHOL down to --There was a file at the time that I maintained that was ₽8 fairly extensive of notes, of checklists. 19 checklist we used to use of these kinds of memos. 20 information I could gather around the exempt, non-21 exempt issue to help further my education that I 22 maintained. 23 Okay. And can you recollect, and I realize it's 10 24 years, but just asking you for the record..... 25

### METRO COURT REPORTING

Α

It's okay.

Can you recollect what positions those notes might Q apply to? 2 I -- I really can't. Ą All right. And would you expect those notes to be in Q existence as of -- I'll make this a two-part question 5 but I'll give it to you one part at time: As of today? 6 承 They could be in some conex somewhere buried. Are they accessible? I've moved offices many times and all 8 that. I -- I don't know if I could ever..... 9 Would you expect that they would have been accessible  $\mathfrak{Q}_0$ as of 2003? 11 I think when the prior deposition was given, Ken, I 42. tried to find as much infor- -- as I could. 13 Okay. **Q**4 And if it didn't surface then, it isn't going to **A**5 surface now. 16 Okay. So as of your prior deposition, if it was **Q**7 something you could have come across you would have got 18 it for us? 19 I would have pulled it out. ₽0 All right. Very good. Again, in the hopes of saving 21 some time here, in the previous deposition I pointed 22 out a number of passages within these documents that 23 talk about the complications and the difficulties in 24 making the wage and hour exemption determination, you 25

> 745 West Fourth Avenue, Suite 425 Anchorage, Alaska 99501

(907) 276-3876

METRO COURT REPORTING

acknowledged that those were in there. Would you agree

- that making these types of determinations can be 1 difficult and complicated? 2 Sure. Ą In any of these reviews that you did, did All right. Q you ever do some type of time analysis to consider the 5 issue of whether or not an employee was spending 20 6 percent of his or her time doing what might be called 7 rank and file or worker type of duties? 8 Yes. **A** Okay. And how did you do that?  $\mathfrak{Q}_0$ Either through interview of the position, the employee, **A**1 or if I had my own knowledge of being on the project 12 sites, through a combination of those. 13 Okay. And, again, this will sound redundant, are there **Q**4 any written records commemorating those analysis? 15 That haven't already surfaced? No. **₽**6 **Q**7 Okay. Do you know if you ever submitted any of that information to Randy Carr either orally or in writing 18 or somehow? 19 MS. ZOBEL: Other than what's in this stack? 20 MR. COVELL: Right. 21 I sus- -- what I had told you a few years ago in my **A**2 previous deposition would have been all I had. 23
- Q Sure. I understand and appreciate that. I guess that  $METRO\ COURT\ REPORTING$

25

745 West Fourth Avenue, Suite 425 Anchorage, Alaska 99501 (907) 276-3876

was -- whatever I mentioned then, and my recollection

was better two or three years ago than it is today.

1	springs on this question: Had there been a detailed
2	commemoration somehow, like you said in writing done
3	then, it would be a whole lot easier for us today to
4	ascertain what you did or didn't do then, right?
<b>B</b>	Yes.
8	So is it your testimony, then, that your review of
7	those 24 positions or whatever it was we talked about
8	for exempt, non-exempt at the time contemporaneous to
9	these memoranda would have fulfilled Mr. Boyle's
10	request for somebody to be providing him with
11	information concerning exemption, non-exemption by
12	January 15. And let me just make a note here, I don't
13	necessarily know that it happened by then, there's
14	subsequent memos and I'm not sticking on that date as
15	to whether or not it was done by that date, but
16	sometime say within that year? And you want me to ask
17	that again, and be more clear?
18	MS. ZOBEL: I have no clue what you're asking.
19	MR. COVELL: Okay.
<b>⊉</b> 0	I think I actually understand the question.
21	MS. ZOBEL: If Mark understands it, go ahead.
<b>⊉</b> 2	Let me make the comment, I you saw it and you
23	pointed it out in one of the first memos. I wrote, you
24	know, interoffice memo to the controller, the CFO, at
25	the time and basically said I have questions and
	concerns about the exempt issue that's in the field $METRO\ COURT\ REPORTING$

- today. Shortly, thereafter, you'll see Chris Boyle's
- e-mail back out to the field, I'm not copied on it,
- he's asking three weeks later in copying those same
- people that I wrote to, the CFO and the controller.
- Q (By Mr. Covell) I appreciate the information, but let
- 6 me just stop you to be clear.
- A Yes.
- So when you're talking about your initial memo you're
- g talking about December 7?
- $A_0$  Right.
- Q<sub>1</sub> The first page of it?
- A2 Right.
- Q3 And then you're calling this second page of it, Chris
- Boyle, December 26, his e-mail, right?
- A5 Correct.
- Q6 Okay. Go ahead please.
- MS. ZOBEL: Actually, it's not an e-mail, I

think it's a memo.

- A9 This is the assumption 10 years ago, but I'm going to
- 20 -- the world as it was then, I'm thinking -- I'm quite
- certain that Chris Boyle probably reacted in a positive
- to my memo that was probably passed on to him. He was
- not a direct report of mine, but I'm sure it was passed
- over and he's saying okay, let's check other sites out
- there because of these other company heads, the

Fredricksons, the Gabrielsons, the Laasches, the

## METRO COURT REPORTING

Cehulas, these are other people out there. I'm not 1 So he's saying, look, I'm going to get -- Mark copied. 2 is doing the analysis for the work that he's oversight 3 -- let's, in turn -- let's look at the rest of pie out 4 there. 5 (By Mr. Covell) Okay. And if you'd turn.... 8 承 Now.... Go ahead. Oh, okay. And the -- you -- part of your question, the **A** January 15th, I was probably well underway. I don't 10 know that my memo with Mr. Carr are those dates -- but, 11 I was probably well underway of doing some type of 12 analysis already. 13 Sure. Let's turn a few pages back to what's labeled --**Q**4 and it should be inked in ZAPC0180, and it's to you 15 from Boyle April 4, '97? 16 **₽**7 Yes. And would this document then be subsequent **Q**8 communication in regard to, at least in part, the 19 exemption, non-exemption issue we've been discussing? 20 Yes, as his first paragraph: In follow-up to your **⊉**1 questions of appropriateness -- sure. 22 All right. And let's turn to the next page 181 there, **Q**3 you see, he's still making the recommendation at 24 parenthesis one there: Review all occupations where 25

## METRO COURT REPORTING

745 West Fourth Avenue, Suite 425 Anchorage, Alaska 99501 (907) 276-3876

there may be questions concerning classification of

- exempt, non-exempt foremen and other personnel, et
- 2 cetera, right?
- A Yes. You want confirmation that you just read that?
- 4 Sure.
- Q I want confirmation that Mr. Boyle's memo to you is
- 6 recommending that all occupations where there may be
- questions concerning they are properly classified, be
- g reviewed. That's the direction there, right or wrong?
- A Yes.
- $Q_0$  All right. And then subsequent to that starting with
- 201 through the end of it, appear to be documents -- or
- is it fair to say that they're documents pertain to
- your communications with Mr. Carr generally concerning
- the material supervisor job?
- As Correct.
- Q6 Okay. And again, you haven't had a chance to read --
- well you read this WHOL letter prior to the deposition,
- 18 right?
- Ag Correct.
- Qo And in there, in that WHOL letter, there's a discussion
- about paying supervisors whether exempt or not for
- every hour worked. And if you want to take time and
- review this that's.....
- A4 I think that's -- yes, I think that's correct.
- Q5 Okay. Did APC ever pay any supervisory person monies pursuant to this determination that they're eligible

- for pay for all hours worked?
- A Did we ever pay any supervisor --
- Let me back up here. What I take this to mean is that
- if the supervisor works, let's say, supposed to work 12
- hours and you get a certain amount of money for 12
- 6 hours. If he works 13 hours he should get 1 hour of
- g straight time, do you take it to mean that or do you
- 8 take it mean something different?
- A If we classify them in this supervisory classification.
- Qo Okay. So, it would mean that he worked hours, he'd get
- one hour of straight time, but no premium pay for
- 12 overtime?
- Ay You could classi- -- right, that's -- I think that's
- what his determination letter says, right?
- Ω<sub>5</sub> So, then, my question to you is: Did APC ever pay
- anybody from that classification in that manner? In
- other words, if a guy worked 13, did he get his extra
- hour of straight time?
- Ag Beyond our 12-hour day, you mean?
- Q<sub>0</sub> Right.
- An I don't recall.
- Q2 Okay. And, again, it may sound redundant, follow-up
- question: Are there any records that you're aware of
- that would demonstrate that that did happen?
- As That I don't recall.
- Q Okay. Did you or APC ever address any employees in METRO COURT REPORTING

- that classification and tell them that they were 1 entitled to get straight time pay for every hour 2 worked? In other words for that 13th or subsequent 3 hour? 4 I don't recall. I know it was one of our A classifications and it was out there. Do I -- I don't 6 remember a specific conversation with the supervisor. 7 That would have probably been a tier below me. 8 Okay. Q At the time. **Α**0 All right. Well, for instance, when his letter came **Q**1 out it might be, but I don't know this because I wasn't 12 there, that somebody goes to the individuals in his job 13 and says we need to pay you for every hour worked. 14 subsequent to today or prior to today, whatever, we'll 15 pay you for your time over 12 hours at the straight 16 time rate? 17 It could have easily happened, if this was an issue for ₽8 me at the time, I communicated well to my direct 19 I think all of my direct reports at the time 20 were classified as exempt which I was comfortable with. 21 They, in turn, could have gone through their next tier 22 where they would have had supervisors under them and 23
- Q<sub>5</sub> Okay. But....

A I am not aware of it.

### METRO COURT REPORTING

could have communicated this, yes.

- All right. So you're not aware that anybody paid
- anybody any money for all hours worked pursuant to this
- 3 information coming to your attention?
- I think it's happened, but I don't recall, like you
- said, was it Jonny Jones, I don't remember.
- Well let's speak more generally, than Jonny Jones. To
- the extent that you think it's happened, you know, who,
- what, when, where, why, how? What are the
- 9 circumstances of it?
- And then I don't recall. I really don't.
- Q1 All right. And again, it may sound redundant, are you
- aware of any records to that effect?
- A3 No.
- Q4 All right.
- MR. COVELL: Let's go off record madame clerk.
- 16 (Off record)
- 17 (On record)
- Q8 (By Mr. Covell) As far as you know Mr. Nelson, did
- anybody talk to John Gilbert about what he did on a day
- 20 to day basis as safety supervisor?
- A1 I don't know. I wasn't -- he was after my time.
- Q2 Okay. But he was there, I represent to you he was
- there '01, '03, so you would have been way up at the
- top at the food chain and he would have been somewhere
- close to the bottom, right?
- A Correct.

- Okay. And that comports with your prior answers that Q you know his name? 2 (No audible answer) Ą Okay. Do you recollect that back in 2003 we could find Q a job description for safety supervisor? 5 It's.... ð Let me represent to you that I had thought it was in Q your deposition, that we discussed that and I was told 8 there was none. I looked this morning and didn't see 9 it in your deposition so it may be Mr. Boyle's 10 deposition. And I recognize you're telling me memories 11 have faded, but do you recollect having a safety 12 supervisor position description ever, I guess? 13 Oh, I'm sure at the time I was doing -- we put together ₽4 job descriptions for virtually all positions on the 15 Slope so at the time, mid- to late-90's there would 16 have been one. 17
- Q8 Okay. Would you expect that in 2003, that we would
- have been able to obtain a copy of one either for the
- 20 <u>Zuber</u> or <u>Gilbert</u> litigation?
- And the supervisor of --
- Q2 Right.
- There's probably one somewhere. I don't know where
- 24 today.
- Q5 All right. Let me give you a couple of exhibits here.

We need to get this marked. You can start reviewing  $METRO\ COURT\ REPORTING$ 

1	the former Gilbert 2.
2	COURT REPORTER: This will be N-3.
3	(Deposition Exhibit N-3 marked)
4	MR. COVELL: Here's one for you to keep.
5	COURT REPORTER: And I have two, and I'm going
go put	a Z on here?
7	MS. ZOBEL: No.
8	COURT REPORTER: All right. No Z.
9	MR. COVELL: See, we agreed on something. And
gg ahea	d and mark this one as well please.
11	COURT REPORTER: N-4 is marked.
12	(Deposition Exhibit N-4 marked)
2₃	(By Mr. Covell) And if you look at N-3 and N-4,
14	particularly the third page have you had a chance to
15	review that?
<b>A</b> 6	You want me to read this?
<b>Q</b> 7	Well if you look at N-4, it's APC1793, do you agree or
18	disagree with that describing, I guess, under the
19	heading essential functions of the safety supervisor.
20	Does that appear to be accurate or inaccurate or
<b>⊉</b> 1	Yes, it looks good.
<b>Q</b> 2	All right. And then I draw your attention under job
23	description, there's a box here checked AES Operations
24	and Maintenance and also down here there's an effective
25	date 01/01/04. Given those indicators is it possible
	for you to determine when this might have been $METROCOURTREPORTING$

1	generated, this particular document?
<u> </u>	I'd assume it was I assume it was generated around
3	the the effective date. This document was around
4	January of '04.
<b>©</b>	Okay. And when did AES Operations and Maintenance,
6	Inc. come into being, if you can tell us?
孝	I don't recall the exact date, it was either 2003,
8	2004, when we when we changed the names legally over
9	to
20	Okay.
<b>卦</b> 1	Your question's around from APC to AES, I presume?
Ω2	Right. Something in that timeframe?
<b>⊉</b> 3	Somewhere in that timeframe.
<b>Q</b> 4	Very good. All right.
15	MR. COVELL: Let me get this one marked here
płease.	
17	COURT REPORTER: This will be Exhibit N-5. Is
ig goin	g to have a Z in front of it?
19	MS. ZOBEL: No.
20	MR. COVELL: No.
21	(Deposition Exhibit N-5 marked)
<b>Q</b> 2	(By Mr. Covell) And since N-5's an organizational
23	chart of what would appear to be the safety department,
24	is it correct that you're aware that around April 2003,
25	the safety supervisor position was either renamed or
	reclassified?

- A Correct.
- Q Okay. And that became -- well what title was given to
- the position that used to be safety supervisor, if you
- 4 know?
- Beyond this org I'd say -- you mean beyond the safety
- 6 supervisor here, or I'm not sure I --
- Q Let me back up.
- A Okay.
- My recollection from Mr. Smith's deposition is that
- around April 2003, your company eliminated the safety
- 11 supervisor job and created a job that had similar
- 12 functions and would have fit in this organizational
- chart at the safety supervisor level, does that comport
- 14 with your knowledge?
- As Okay. And, you know, that -- those details now are
- getting -- or would have been handled more so between
- the business unit manger and -- and his direct reports,
- who would have been Doug Smith at the time.
- Q9 All right. So, I can take that as an I don't know
- answer then, correct?
- A₁ Yes.
- Q<sub>2</sub> Is that fair?
- A3 Probably.
- Q4 All right. Well let me cut to the quick here: Do you
- know what different duties a -- whatever successor

position there may have been, would have had from a

## METRO COURT REPORTING

- safety supervisor? In other words, one day you've got
- the safety supervisor in there, he has certain duties.
- The next day, a week, a month later, six months later
- 4 -- whenever it is, the safety supervisor position is
- gone. There's a new position there, and they have
- 6 duties --
- Then, from when I did my analysis, six years prior to
- 8 this or whatever timeframe?
- I'm sorry, I didn't understand the answer.
- An Okay. Well it was really a question.
- $Q_1$  Okay.
- A2 You're asking -- I think the distinction you're making
- -- correct me if I'm wrong, the safety supervisor as it
- is here in whatever year this was, 2003 versus my
- analysis of a safety supervisor in the year 1997, or
- 16 whatever.
- $Q_7$  No, no -- in around April of 2003, when the job got
- changed from safety supervisor to some other
- designation, which may be -- does the phrase safety
- 20 coordinator ring any bells with you?
- No, but are we talking about this one? The one that
- says safety supervisor here?
- Q3 Right. We're talking about that block on the
- 24 organization chart.
- As Okay. Okay.
- Q I've been told that that job no longer exists.

- Today.
- Q Today and as of April '03.
- A Okay.
- Q You don't know?
- A I don't know.
- All right. Now, this will sound redundant, and I think
- I know what the answer's going to be, but just to be
- g clear: Do you know what the difference between the two
- jobs would have been as far as duties were?
- $\mathbb{A}_0$  No.
- $Q_1$  And, again, recognizing that you barely know
- Mr. Gilbert, do you have any reason -- withdraw that.
- Do you know if APC has any records to dispute
- Mr. Gilbert's claim that he worked varying hours while
- employed both as a safety specialist and safety
- supervisor, which, for example, he recorded in the
- 17 ranges of 12, 13, 14, 15 hours a day?
- Mould there be -- am I aware of his records, or am I
- 19 aware of --
- Q<sub>0</sub> Mr. Gilbert claims he worked varying hours while he was
- employed, from 12 hours on up, sometimes towards 20.
- But, generally, 12, 13, 14, 15 hours. My two-part
- question, question number one is: Are you aware of any
- 24 records that would dispute his assertion that he worked
- those hours?
- I would have to answer it this way, is if he claimed to  $METRO\ COURT\ REPORTING$

1	I'm not I've never seen his claim so I don't know
2	what it is. If, he were, because of my familiarity
3	with the work if he were to claim I worked 15 hours
4	in the field and there were field records to document
5	that claimed something else, it could be anywhere from
6	flight logs to billeting or camp records that he could
7	check I mean, there are lots of different records
8	available that could contradict his claim, certainly
9	could be out there. I'm not aware of those, nor have I
10	seen any research or
<b>Q</b> 1	All right. And, again, to be clear for the record, you
12	don't have any personal knowledge that would dispute
13	Mr. Gilbert's that he worked a certain number of hours
14	any day?
14 <b>⊉</b> 5	any day? No.
<b></b>	No.
<b>⊉</b> 5 <b>ℚ</b> 6	No.  Okay. I represent to you in reviewing your last
<b>Δ</b> 5 <b>Q</b> 6 17	No.  Okay. I represent to you in reviewing your last deposition, you said that you had legal counsel in-
<b>1</b> 5 <b>2</b> 6 <b>1</b> 7 <b>1</b> 8	No.  Okay. I represent to you in reviewing your last deposition, you said that you had legal counsel inhouse at APC since about 2000, does that seem to be
<b>1</b> 5	No.  Okay. I represent to you in reviewing your last deposition, you said that you had legal counsel inhouse at APC since about 2000, does that seem to be correct?
♣5 №6 17 18 19 ♣0	No.  Okay. I represent to you in reviewing your last deposition, you said that you had legal counsel inhouse at APC since about 2000, does that seem to be correct?  Yes, at least from then. I don't remember I'm
♣5 №6 17 18 19 ♣0 21	No.  Okay. I represent to you in reviewing your last deposition, you said that you had legal counsel inhouse at APC since about 2000, does that seem to be correct?  Yes, at least from then. I don't remember I'm trying to remember when the we've always had some
♣5 №6 17 18 19 ♣0 21 22	No.  Okay. I represent to you in reviewing your last deposition, you said that you had legal counsel inhouse at APC since about 2000, does that seem to be correct?  Yes, at least from then. I don't remember I'm trying to remember when the we've always had some counsel at the parent company, but I let's say yes.
♣5 №6 17 18 19 ♣0 21 22 №3	No.  Okay. I represent to you in reviewing your last deposition, you said that you had legal counsel inhouse at APC since about 2000, does that seem to be correct?  Yes, at least from then. I don't remember I'm trying to remember when the we've always had some counsel at the parent company, but I let's say yes.  All right. So, if somebody had wanted to consult with

- A supervisor, manager position, sure.
- Which yourself and Mr. Boyle would fit --
- Absolutely. Uh-huh (affirmative).
- Q Did a safety supervisor do intermittent work or
- substitute on a regular basis for the duties performed
- 6 by a safety specialist?
- Repeat the question.
- Q Okay. Let me sort of frame it up for you. I'm not
- g trying to trick you here.
- $A_0$  That's all right.
- Q1 I hope I'm not. Okay. Safety specialist has certain
- 12 duties, right?
- A3 Correct.
- Q4 Okay. Safety supervisor has certain duties, some of
- which the company maintains are different than safety
- 16 specialist, right?
- A7 Correct.
- Qg Okay. Did the safety supervisor do work on an
- intermittent or substitute basis that the safety
- specialist did? You want me to give you an example?
- ⊉1 Yes.
- Q2 Okay. For instance, the safety supervisor might be in
- the office doing whatever they do, might they be called
- out to the field to do a job, or a piece of work that a
- safety specialist would normally do?
- A It could certainly happen, sure.

<b>Q</b>	And when it happened would that be fair to call that
2	happening on an intermittent or substitute basis?
<b>A</b> 3	I I would think it would be it would not be
4	frequently.
Ş	Okay. But, here's what I think I've heard over the
6	years in both these cases. Safety supervisor might be
7	back at the office doing whatever they do, and the
8	safety specialist sort of had areas to work on right?
9	They might have a pad or a section of the oil field?
<b>A</b> 0	Okay.
<b>Q</b> 1	And the safety specialist who was sort of assigned
12	there may be tied up in another job and the client's
13	calling and saying we want, I don't know, confined
14	space entry permit or we need some safety service in
15	another portion of our area now, would a safety
16	supervisor go out and cover that work?
<b>A</b> 7	I would suspect, sure. The client might call a
18	supervisor and say, look the specialist is tied up,
19	could you come out and give us an opinion, could you
20	give us could you take a second look, could you
21	advise us on this, that type of thing. It certainly
22	could it happen? Absolutely. With the special
23	would the supervisor respond, I don't know why they
24	wouldn't.
<b>Q</b> 5	Okay. All right. And, just trying to be clear, the
	question is: To your knowledge did the safety

745 West Fourth Avenue, Suite 425 Anchorage, Alaska 99501 (907) 276-3876

METRO COURT REPORTING

1	supervisors do safety specialist work from time to
2	time?
<u> </u>	Not that I'm aware of in not that I'm aware of.
Q	Okay.
<u>₿</u>	Because it crosses over. There's a certain cross over,
6	so
<b>Q</b>	Okay. The certain crossover being that the safety
8	supervisor does a lot of the same tasks as the safety
9	specialist, is that
<b>⊉</b> 0	Well the safety specialist is a person who's out there
11	with the ears and eyes and interpreter and and is
12	certainly some one in enforcement. A lot of dif a
13	lot of different roles that the specialist plays, so
14	the supervisor certainly should no all of those roles,
15	and and also then have a maybe even higher level
16	of background to be able to assist or to offer a second
17	opinion or to interpret the policy or to write
18	whatever it may be out there. But I don't know I
19	don't recall I think you're asking, and I don't
20	recall whether the safety supervisor went out and did
21	covered an area for a week, let's say, for the
22	specialist or something like that or two days or three
23	days. I don't think that type of thing happened.
24	All right. But for an
<b>⊉</b> 5	Frequently.

# .....afternoon or something they might? $METRO\ COURT\ REPORTING$

Q

- A Possibly.
- Q Okay. Well I mean, for instance, looking at this N --
- 3 I didn't write it on here.
- 4 (Off record comments)
- A Three.
- 6 MS. ZOBEL: Three.
- A Four.
- 8 MR. COVELL: And four.
- Q (By Mr. Covell) And you looked at this page, 1793 and
- you go down and look at number 3, it says inspects or
- tours organization facilities to detect existing or
- potential accident and health hazards, recommends
- corrective or preventative actions. That's a duty of
- 14 the safety supervisor, right?
- A5 Correct.
- Q6 Okay. That would also be a duty of the safety
- 17 specialist, right?
- Absolutely.
- Q9 All right. And so the safety supervisor would do any
- of these types of things on 1 through 10, on a daily
- 21 basis, is that correct?
- A2 The safety supervisor as well as the safety specialist
- should be doing these 24 hours a day.
- Q4 Okay.
- An That's their role.
- Q That's their job?

<b>A</b>	Right. They're trained in this, right.
<b>Q</b>	Okay. Again, in regard to your prior deposition, I
3	asked you some questions about some of the materials
4	concerning determining exempt, non-exempt, and one of
5	the materials said, one of the most expensive mistakes
6	that can be made or misdetermining somebody from
7	exempt to non-exempt is one of the most expensive
8	mistakes that can be made when ascertaining the
9	overtime status of people, would you agree that that's
10	true?
<b>全</b> 1	Correct.
12	MR. COVELL: Let's go off record.
13	(Off record)
14	(Deposition Exhibit N-6 marked)
15	(On record)
15 <b>Q</b> 6	(On record) (By Mr. Covell) Mr. Nelson, I've handed you a series
<b>Q</b> 6	(By Mr. Covell) Mr. Nelson, I've handed you a series
<b>№</b> 6 17	(By Mr. Covell) Mr. Nelson, I've handed you a series of documents labeled N-6 and there seems to be some
<b>2</b> 6 17 18	(By Mr. Covell) Mr. Nelson, I've handed you a series of documents labeled N-6 and there seems to be some indication that they're called JVA's or job vacancy
<ul><li>\$\mathbb{Q}6\$</li><li>17</li><li>18</li><li>19</li></ul>	(By Mr. Covell) Mr. Nelson, I've handed you a series of documents labeled N-6 and there seems to be some indication that they're called JVA's or job vacancy announcements. Earlier I was asking you in relation
<ul><li></li></ul>	(By Mr. Covell) Mr. Nelson, I've handed you a series of documents labeled N-6 and there seems to be some indication that they're called JVA's or job vacancy announcements. Earlier I was asking you in relation and by this organization if you know what position may
<pre>\$\partial 6\$ 17 18 19 20 21</pre>	(By Mr. Covell) Mr. Nelson, I've handed you a series of documents labeled N-6 and there seems to be some indication that they're called JVA's or job vacancy announcements. Earlier I was asking you in relation and by this organization if you know what position may have filled the void that may have been created by the
<pre>\$\partial 6\$ 17 18 19 20 21 22</pre>	(By Mr. Covell) Mr. Nelson, I've handed you a series of documents labeled N-6 and there seems to be some indication that they're called JVA's or job vacancy announcements. Earlier I was asking you in relation and by this organization if you know what position may have filled the void that may have been created by the safety supervisor job. In looking at these names here,
<pre>\$\Pi\$6 17 18 19 20 21 22 23</pre>	(By Mr. Covell) Mr. Nelson, I've handed you a series of documents labeled N-6 and there seems to be some indication that they're called JVA's or job vacancy announcements. Earlier I was asking you in relation and by this organization if you know what position may have filled the void that may have been created by the safety supervisor job. In looking at these names here, HSET Coordinator, HSE Advisor, Safety Specialist, is

<b>A</b>	I don't know, I wasn't involved with this.
Q	This would appear to be after your time, being 2006,
3	right?
<b>A</b>	Yes, that's way after my time.
<b>©</b>	All right. Drawing your attention, conceptually,
6	anyway back to wage and hour letter 122, would it be
7	fair to say that that particular document would protect
8	APC from having to pay overtime? I'll rephrase that if
9	you like.
<b>⊉</b> 0	For a supervisor's position?
<b>Q</b> 1	Right.
<b></b> 2	That was my understanding at the time.
₽3	Okay. And do you have any reason and has that
14	understanding changed?
<b>⊉</b> 5	No.
16	MR. COVELL: All right. That's all I have.
17	MS. ZOBEL: I have no questions.
18	(Off record)
19	
20	
21	* * * END OF PROCEEDINGS * * *
22	
23	
24	
25	

## METRO COURT REPORTING

1	S I G N A T U R E
2 STATE OF ALASKA 3 THIRD JUDICIAL I 4	) ) ss. DISTRICT )
5	I, MARK C. NELSON, have read the foregoing
deposition and h	have made corrections thereto. Any and all
qhanges, explana	ations, deletions and/or additions to my
gestimony may be	e found on the correction sheet(s) enclosed with
<pre>bhis transcript.</pre>	
10	
11	MARK C. NELSON
12	
\$3ATE OF ALASKA	)
THIRD JUDICIAL I	)ss. DISTRICT )
15	THIS IS TO CERTIFY that on this day of
16	2006, before me appeared MARK C. NELSON, to me
17 known and known	to be the person named in and who executed the
18 foregoing instru 19 sealing the same 20	ument, and acknowledge voluntarily signing and
21	
22	Notary Public in and for State of Alaska, at Anchorage
23	My Commission Expires:
24	
25	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

## CERTIFICATE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA )
STATE OF ALASKA )

I, Jerri Young, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter with Metro Court Reporting, do hereby certify:

THAT the annexed and foregoing Deposition of <u>MARK C.</u>

<u>NELSON</u> was taken before Cheri Tabor on the 15th day of June
2006, commencing at the hour of 10:30 o'clock a.m., at the
offices of DeLisio Moran Geraghty & Zobel, P.C., 943 West 6th
Avenue Anchorage, Alaska 99501, pursuant to Notice to take said
Deposition of said Witness on behalf of the Plaintiff;

THAT the above-named Witness before examination, was duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth;

## METRO COURT REPORTING

THAT this Deposition, as heretofore annexed, is a true and correct transcription of the testimony of said Witness taken by Cheri Tabor and hereafter transcribed by her;

THAT the original of the Deposition transcript will be Bodged in a sealed envelope with the attorney requesting transcription of same, as required by Civil Rule 30(f)(1) Amended, that attorney being:

- 5 MR. KENNETH L. COVELL, Law Offices of Kenneth L. Covell, Attorney at Law, 712 West 8th Avenue, Fairbanks, Alaska 99701;
- 7 THAT I am not a relative, employee or attorney of any of the parties, nor am I financially interested in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal this 29th day of June 2006.

10

11

Jerri Young

12

Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 11/03/07

13

14

15

16

2122232425

17

18

19

20

## METRO COURT REPORTING